

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

July 5, 2007

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Dennis Cope, Lee Madrid, Sally Promer-Nichols, Mery Velastegui

STAFF PRESENT: Gary Lee, Senior Planner; Steven Fischer, Senior Planner; Asma Jeelani, Assistant Planner

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide. Our procedure is as follows:

- A. Staff will give a presentation of the project to the Board.
- B. The applicant then has an opportunity to comment on the project. The speaker should give their name for the record and sign the sign-up sheet.
- C. After the applicant, others in the audience may comment, either in favor or in opposition to the proposal.
- D. After all comments are heard, the Board will discuss the project openly and may request comments or have questions of the Applicant.
- E. The Board members then vote to approve, approve with conditions or deny the project.
- F. If the applicant does not agree with the Design Review Board's decisions, they have the right to appeal and should contact the technical staff member.

RECORDING

The meetings are tape-recorded and the recording will be part of the official record of each case. It is important to identify yourself prior to speaking so that you may be included in the recording.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board Sally Promer-Nichols at 7:12 PM. Design Review Board members Robert Hall, David Wobker and David Scott Meade were excused.

MINUTES

March 1st, 2007:

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. VELASTEGUI AND SECONDED BY MR. COPE TO APPROVE THE MARCH 1, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES AS WRITTEN. MOTION CARRIED (3-0-1), WITH ONE ABSTENTION.

March 15, 2007:

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MS. VELASTEGUI TO APPROVE THE MARCH 15, 2007 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES AS WRITTEN. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

APPROVAL

L070273, Perrigo Park

Description: 15 unit multi-family building with ground floor parking

Location: 8310 165th Ave. NE

Applicant: John Fromel

Staff Contact: Asma Jeelani / (425) 556-2443

Ms. Jelani presented on behalf of the staff regarding the Perrigo Park project. It's a four-story building that will be built in the East Hill sub-area off downtown Redmond. The area in which this building will be is called Perrigo's Plat, and it's at the corner of 183rd and 165th Ave. NE. This project came to the Board for a

pre-application meeting in April, and the Board liked the design and direction of the project very much. The main building materials include brick, horizontal lap and shingle siding. Asphalt shingles will be used on the roofing, and the building has a very nice design, according to staff. Staff doesn't have any changes recommended; however, there are some blank walls that need mitigation, walls that have siding on them. Beyond that, staff has no major issues with the project. There are 19 parking spaces for the 15 units being built.

Mr. Cope asked about the siding, which he didn't think was wood. Mr. Madrid mentioned that some hardy siding would be used as well. Ms. Jelani confirmed this, and said hardy shingles would be used.

Brad Butterfield with Taylor, Gregory, Butterfield Architects presented on behalf of the applicant. Bob Bozarth, the project architect, was present, as were John Promel and Goran Marincovich [sp, didn't sign in], who are the two developers. Butterfield said his feeling from the Board was that the Board was favorable towards the project back in April. One rendering of the project shows what it looks like in the neighborhood. The architect has also brought the architectural site plan, an architectural elevation, and the landscape plan to add context.

Mr. Butterfield mentioned the Board was interested in sustainable materials, and the applicant has changed the project to reflect this. The applicant has hired someone from the Environmental Home Center, and they're working to bring sustainable materials to the interior, specifically, a lot of finish materials like recyclable wood products, carpeting, paint, and then brick on the outside. Mr. Butterfield says the applicant will achieve, through the Master Builders Association's "Built Green" program, a minimum of one star, with two stars very likely. The applicant is very interested in sustainability and built green, so they've attended many seminars with different groups regarding that.

One item the Board mentioned specifically was the 15 brick columns at the fence line, which are quite large. The architect has reduced the number of columns to ten, and they've been narrowed, too. Those columns have also been reduced from 6' tall to 4' feet tall. Kitchen windows also now match the same grid pattern the living room windows have, so the patterns throughout are consistent. Courtyard and site lighting have been improved, providing lights around the building the applicant believes will be appropriate. The lights should not be obtrusive for neighbors.

The board had also asked about deck cantilevers, and the applicant has pulled back on the idea of a dual cantilever. There's now a cantilever on the deck on one side only. The applicant spoke to the concern over the blank wall. The applicant feels the project has great modulation, and the only "blank" wall covers a stairwell. The applicant says it's in an unobtrusive area, and says a stairwell wouldn't allow for openings due to fire code ratings. Architecturally, because of what's happening on either side, he applicant is not bothered by the blank wall, and doesn't want to over-design the project.

Mr. Bozarth spoke to the blank wall issue down at the lower level where the concrete was, and the applicant has added several metal frame trellises with growings coming up the sides to soften up the lower level of the building. Those will help the parking garage concrete wall, in the applicant's opinion.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

Ms. Velastegui:

- Asked about elevations on the project, specifically on the south elevation, and points out that the windows on the older drawings were not shown in these renderings. The applicant said those windows were there.
- Inquired about the east elevation, talking about the blank wall, which is similar to the south elevation. Ms. Velastegui was looking for some kind of opening in one of the levels, as a consideration. The applicant responded that he's tried to put openings in staircases in the past, but that has been problematic in dealing with the building department.
- The staircase is a "two hour" staircase, which has resolved the issue for Ms. Velastegui.
- Suggested on the north elevation that on the fireplace side, some feature might be added to mitigate height. She would like to see some contrast in this area, rather than a tall blank wall. Even a 1' x 1' window might be an answer.

Mr. Madrid:

- Appreciates the applicant's response to the Board's comments earlier, and thinks the applicants have done a wonderful job.
- Wanted clarification on what's been included in the packet, in which he sees a 6' fence in many of the perspectives. The elevations have the fence as 4'. The applicant has confirmed that the 4' height is the one being used.
- Made a comment on lighting during the pre-application. Lighting plans have been provided, and the applicant says he's trying to keep the light down to a low minimum. The light should not extend out past the property too much. The courtyard, right now, will probably have some low footlights that wouldn't be up and obtrusive. There may be some wall lights for safety and security, but it won't be too much.
- Asked about how the entrance was lit. The applicant says there will be down lighting along the back of the entrance so people will be illuminated as they come in, to provide security. There will be lighting along the side as well to light up the other door coming in from the courtyard.
- Mr. Madrid says he's happy with that, and thinks the project is looking nice.

Mr. Cope:

- Agrees that this is a handsome project.
- Says the fence is the right dimension, and he likes it a lot as a secure, but not prohibitive fence.
- Adding the trellises to the blank wall should liven it up.
- Appreciates the attention to the "Built Green" concept.
- Had a question about a trellis or some sort of protection for the top four units, on their decks. The applicant responded that there's a small overhang, but he didn't want to cover the top decks. The applicant had a consensus that his team did not want to bring the roofline out.
- Wasn't thinking about extending the roof; considering filtered light like through a trellis, though not something that would shed water. Applicant says the team misunderstood Mr. Cope's comments at the last meeting as a desire to extend the roofline.
- Believes it would increase livability, plus would add another layer of detail. Applicant says he heard covered deck. Mr. Cope says this is something that could come back to the staff.
- Concerned about the north wall and providing some kind of opening, even if it's purely decorative. Staff could handle this issue. Would like to make that opening a condition of approval.
- Says the project has a lot of quality to it, and loves the entry and the fence.
- Applicant says windows on the side of the fireplaces could work, and the Board members say they would find that agreeable.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Would like to add a nice, big hornbeam that would tall and narrow on that north elevation.
- Has concerns about the north elevation landscaping. She's okay with the silao and weeping cedars presented, but points out they're not screen trees. She'd prefer to see arbutus or some of the larger shrubs. What's shown on the elevation is not the plants that are specified in the plans. She'd like to see more variety and a few more larger plants.
- Says the blank wall in the front is not horrible, but says a columnar-type tree could provide a "screen" of sorts. Applicant points out that there's a room coming out from the other wall that has windows there. He wouldn't like to see a big tree in front of that window. Ms. Promer-Nichols says a narrow tree would be a good answer. A new columnar red beech tree might be a new, interesting option. The tree itself would be happy in such a spot.
- Thinks this fits in the neighborhood seamlessly, without being kitschy.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COPE AND SECONDED BY LEE MADRID TO APPROVE L070273, PERRIGO PARK, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) The staff standard conditions should apply.
- (2) Additionally, the applicant will study a trellis-like covering on the top-floor decks, and work out the details with staff
- (3) The applicant will introduce windows on the north elevation, flanking the fireplaces, to the satisfaction of staff.

- (4) On landscaping, the applicant will increase the amount and variety of landscaping on the landscaping plan to look more like the rendered north elevation that the Board was shown this evening. The applicant will also study an appropriate tree at the south elevation's blank wall. Staff commented that the "Built Green" situation will handle that concern at the time the building permit is applied for.**

MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

APPROVAL

L070099, Mondavio Lot 71 SPE

Description: Construct 33 buildings with 108 housing units, consisting of a combination of 5-unit townhomes, duplexes, and 5-unit row houses

Location: 10458 157th Pl. NE

Request: Approval of Landscape Plan

Architect: Ginger Garff, with Webber & Thompson

Applicant: Elizabeta Stacishin-Moura, with The Dwelling Company

Staff Contact: Steve Fischer / (425) 556-2432

Mr. Fischer presented the project on behalf of the staff. The Board approved this project back on April 12, 2007. At that meeting, there were a number of conditions outlined in the staff report, which Mr. Fischer did not list in detail. Essentially, those conditions required that certain aspects of the project come back before the Board, mostly related to the landscape plan itself. This project has continued to move forward, and it's received its site plan entitlement approval. Staff has also received PRD approval from Redmond City Council, and a clear and grade permit has been issued. There has been a pre-construction meeting for the clear and grade part of the project. The staff is still working through the civil construction drawings. The applicant says she's just about ready to move some dirt. The project is reviewing some building permits as well. Mr. Fischer would like to get the Board's approval soon, as this project will be built later this summer.

The issues under staff analysis include street trees along Redwood Road that was included in the plans incorrectly. There is a large green space that does not indicate irrigation. The Board had called for a more prominent entry feature for vehicles off 156th. The south entrance calls for large red maples, the northern entrance has a low, curving stone wall that will be framed by flowering cherry trees and ground cover.

Fencing is another issue, and there are two locations where fencing will be used. One is at the overlook of the wetland, where the applicant had aluminum railings that were running horizontally in orientation. Staff is recommending those railings run vertical to keep people from climbing up on to it, which could cause someone to possibly spill over the top. Vertical railings could also prevent the fence from being damaged, if someone climbed up onto it and bounced on it to bend it.

The staff is also concerned about the wood fence detail for the fence along Redmond-Woodinville Road. It's 6' high with horizontal board orientation, again. The detail didn't show the construction of that fence to meet the requirements for noise attenuation, but that is an issue staff can address. With that fence, the staff is encouraging the Board to look at the aesthetic aspect of it, and staff will address issues of noise. Staff is recommending approval of the landscape plan with the following conditions:

1. The street trees along Redmond Road should be Norway maple, with spacing at 30' on center.
2. Areas over 500 square feet should be irrigated.
3. Orientation of the railing at the overlook should be vertical and not horizontal, as depicted in the plans.
4. The additional standard conditions concerning inconsistencies will apply as well.

Mr. Tilbe, speaking for the applicant, says he's tried to answer the "shopping list" full of concerns from the Board. He provided an irrigation master plan, which shows additional spurs off on the right side, with some lines that come down into the wetland area. The applicant will provide temporary zones to irrigate that area for the first few years to make sure it establishes itself. A new planting plan has been provided, showing that the street trees have been changed out along Redmond-Woodinville road to be Norway

maples, which the city requested. The Board was also questioning about Japanese maples along the street and the interior road. The applicant has changed out those trees to Raywood ash.

Mr. Fischer brought up the idea of red maple because they're commonly used as street trees in places like the City of Seattle. He has no problem with that type of tree being used on a private street, but it has to be the right variety. It's not on Redmond's street tree list, but this tree is not on a public street. Mr. Fischer wants to make sure a Japanese maple, if it's used, is the right tree for the right spot. The applicant responded that, in going through the tree plan and talking with the utilities, the utilities are offset from each other, which means a smaller tree has to be used. A lot of root barriers will be needed in the area to get close to the utilities. The applicant originally considered a smaller tree, but now he's looking towards using the Raywood ash, which is a nice, big street tree, using a root barrier.

The applicant shows newly-proposed aluminum fence for the overlook, using vertical stanchions rather than horizontal rails. The applicant agrees that would be a safer fence. With the wooden fence along Woodinville road, what look like openings on that fence are actually battens. It's a solid fence with no openings in it, and it will be painted.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

Ms. Velastegui:

- Asked about a landmark at the entrance to the neighborhood. The applicant pointed out there was a low, stone wall at the entrance with cherry trees behind it. That motif repeats itself in the communal play area, with a stone wall wrapping around the scene and gathering space.

Mr. Madrid:

- Asked how high the wall was, to which the applicant responded between 2'-3.'
- Has concerns about the entrances. Likes the north entrance with the small stone wall, but has been struggling with the other entrance. He sees the common landscaping elements, but does not see any distinguishing mark to denote it as an entrance. Asked the applicant for clarification.
- The applicant responded that the southern entrance was a tighter entrance, with frontages that close it. The garden there is quite strong, and there's a hedge treatment that goes through the project in bands, using Escalonia, a dark, evergreen plant with small red flowers, in front of the units. There's a strong hedge element with perennials behind it. In front of the hedge there are the red maple street trees, and then the buildings start. There's not a lot of space, and the client, typically, does not use entry signs.
- Mr. Madrid brought up his concern, again, that there's no landscape element that's different from the rest of the property that denotes the entrance. The applicant responded that there was a common theme of the hedges.
- Mr. Madrid wants to make sure the entrance speaks to the idea that you're entering the community. The applicant noted that there's a special pavement at the crossing on the north that is repeated on the south, which makes it unique. The applicant mentioned the idea of bringing over the cherry trees, specifically, to the two entrances. The Board verbalized its approval of such an idea.
- Mr. Madrid is also concerned about the fencing, and he liked the fencing used before. He understands the staff's concerns about the horizontal fencing, but wants more of a wood element to that fence. The applicant responded that there's a standard wetland fence, which is a split-rail variety. The applicant went with the aluminum as a continuation of what was done.
- Mr. Madrid would like to see more of a natural fence. He likes the reliability and sustainability of aluminum, but points out that the view is over a wetlands, and would rather not have the aluminum juxtaposed with that view of nature. Some greenery or some other landscape element might make the region there a little softer. Mr. Madrid would like to keep this area as a tranquil, wonderful spot in the community.
- Would like to see something more natural and softer there.
- Agrees with the staff's concerns and comments.
- Applicant responded to the idea of using a wood fence, saying wood would not be as durable. Mr. Madrid says he understands that, but would like to explore some alternatives more closely. He says another planting element might soften the look of it. Some type of black fence with a wood cap might be an alternative, as suggested by the applicant.

Mr. Cope:

- Thinks the applicant has done a good job in responding to the Board.
- The detail on the wood fence, specifically on the posts, has an angled top, but it's still a cut, exposed surface. Mr. Cope would suggest a metal cap on top of that, like some aged copper. It could potentially save some money down the line.
- Likes the fence comments made by Mr. Madrid, and agrees with the idea of black aluminum with a wood cap.

Ms. Velastegui:

- Doesn't have much more to add. Is concerned about the entrances, and asks if a small marker stone might be set aside with a "Mondavio" logo on it.
- Mentions that she's not an expert on landscaping. Points out face #6 might be a good place for such a marker, and asks the applicant to consider that.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Thinks it's a nice landscape plan, and thinks it will be different and sparkly. Likes what the applicant is trying to do.
- Echoes Mr. Madrid's comments about the landscaping at the entry points.
- Isn't sure that an over-developed entry would be a good idea. The applicant says that's what she's trying to do.
- Ms. Promer-Nichols wants to make sure the tree treatments are subtle.
- Likes the play area; thinks it's fun. Likes the fence comments, and does like the horizontal fence detail.
- Wants to move on with the project so the Board doesn't have to see it again. It's been on the Board's plate for seven or eight years.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. COPE TO APPROVE L070099, AND L070146, MONDAVIO LOT 71 SPE, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) Applicant will work out with staff the exploration of a wood top to the aluminum fence proposed.
- (2) The applicant will determine with staff some interesting placement of cherry trees at the second entrance to denote the entrance there.
- (3) The applicant will put caps on the columns of either wood or metal, to be worked out with staff.

MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. VELASTEGUI TO CLOSE THE MEETING, AND SECONDED BY MR. MADRID. MOTION CARRIED (4-0), MEETING CLOSED AT 8:02 P.M.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE060075, Center Pointe

Description: Develop two new structures, including a two-story office building replicating the original Redmond Train Station, 3,300-3,400 square feet; and a six-story mixed use/residential building with approximately 15,000 square feet of retail, 130 residential units, and structured parking

Location: 16325 Cleveland Street

Architect: Peter Watson

Applicant: Redmond Gateway LLC

Prior Review Dates: 05/03/07 and 06/07/07

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / (425) 556-2418

Gary Lee, Planner for the city of Redmond, pointed out that this was the third pre-application meeting for this project. An updated packet has been handed out. The colors have been updated, and the palette seems nicer, according to staff. The silo has been grounded by raising the canopy up. The issue of wrapping the silo has been addressed with a bracket tying it to the building. The area between the top of the windows and the top of the cornice line needs a little more work, according to staff. The curb canopy that was originally shown at an earlier meeting may be, in staff's opinion, a little more appropriate than the

flat curb canopy, but the staff will let the Board decide that. Both options are in the new packet. The bays shown projecting out on the south side, in the BNSF right of way, actually do not project into the setback.

Mr. Watson, on behalf of the applicant, spoke with his colleague, Mark Millett, about the project. The packet is a current representation of the project, but the vignette scenes on pages 20, 21, and 22 are from two weeks ago, and not current. The material for those three perspectives is in a packet handed out just prior to the meeting. These perspectives are on PowerPoint as well.

The applicant pointed out the basics of the project for staff who haven't seen it in a while. It's the old feed store site located on Cleveland, between Gilman and 164th. There's actually a small dogleg that represents a portion of the BNSF right of way, which is also part of the property. It fronts up against the BNSF property on the south side. There are two buildings proposed for this project, a small office building that is to the lower left-hand corner of the site plan. It fronts on Leary Way, and has its roots architecturally in an old railway depot located here. The feed store was on this site until 2001. The silos have taken on more importance to the applicant in planning for the new building. The office building will be about 3,400 square feet, primarily with painted lap siding on the exteriors with traditional window fenestrations and overhangs on the south and north sides of the building. There's a connection from the Leary Way right of way, through a sidewalk and covered overhang, that goes into the interior part of the site, and Gilman.

The larger structure has retail on the primary elevations. Cleveland is up to the north, and there are retail parking places in the center of the building that is accessed off of 164th, which is to the right. There are two entrances off of Gilman, which is actually not a through street, for the residents in the upper floors of the building. The next level up is the courtyard level and the first level of residential units. The units are located around the courtyard, and there are 130 of them on five floors. It's wood construction sitting on a concrete podium; it's a typical residential level.

The applicant has developed models of the building to represent where the applicant is currently. The overall massing was an attempt to respond to the comments of the board. The sense of having too much inactivity, perhaps, in the way the building terminated. The applicant has addressed that by lowering the cornice lines on the two primary bays, so that there's a little less regularity at the top of the building, and a little more up and down rather than the constant, uniform cornice line. The applicant has studied the corner element extensively. It's meant to be a recollection to the silo of the feed store that was on the site at one time. The applicant has tried to knit the silo into the fabric of the building more by having struts that turn into a band that wrap around the perimeter of the silo and connect over to the deck on the Gilman Avenue elevation. The applicant feels a lot more comfortable about the canopy at the street level, the column, and the silo are working together.

There was a more rectilinear canopy the last time the applicant presented to the Board; now, there's a more circular element that mirrors the form of the silo on the corner. One column will draw some discussion tonight, but the applicant feels the roundness of the column, the roundness of the canopy at street level, and the roundness of the silo form on the corner are appropriate. The primary residential entrance to the building off of Cleveland has been changed, with a form that's somewhat similar to the canopy at the corner. It's just a semi-circular projection off the masonry wall; solid, not glazed. The applicant has also tried to differentiate the top of the building from the base of the building and the midsection by changing the window fenestration on the top level. It's changed so that it's different from the four floors below. It's in two of the bays as you move towards 164th Street.

The applicant has lowered the cornice lines on the bays in the interior, and left the ones in the corner and the end high. The lower ones help turn the corner when you see the next elevation. The applicant says those lower cornices should help balance the south elevation of the building. Twenty years from now, when there's more pedestrian activity in the Burlington Northern right of way, it will be more of a street. The developer is interested in putting retail units fronting the railroad right of way in the hopes that someday, there will be pedestrian circulation and activity to warrant that type of use.

In the south elevation of the building, showing the courtyard, there's a pedestrian connection from the courtyard down to a walkway fronting up against the railroad right of way. The Gilman Street elevation

shows entrances into the pedestrian garage. The drawings might be better in the booklets the Board has been given. The applicant is very comfortable with the variety and richness of the colors proposed now. The colors are helping reinforce the projecting bay and the recess, and also tries to differentiate the height, or cap of the building, on the top floor. It's the applicant's preference to use a galvanized finish for the corner. If it were painted product, it would lose some of its strength in being able to recognize it as a silo. A galvanized or zinc-aluminum product would be best. The canopy below would be a galvanized steel frame, as would another canopy. There are elements of galvanization in the corner and all the handrails on the decks. The level of material starts at the corner, and is carried up to the primary elevations of the building. The elevation drawing from Gilman and from the BNSF right of way offer some different perspectives as well.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

Mr. Madrid:

- Likes the direction the project is moving, and says the applicant has done some good things. Is happy with the way it's going.
- Likes the grounded silo, thinks that part is much improved.
- Asks about the cylindrical vs. the square column; he's fine with the circular column, but he'll defer to the experts.
- Not convinced with the bands, or spindles, on the silo. Can't see them, really, but liked the silo as it was. Applicant points out they can't be seen here from the upper elevations, but can be seen from the street elevations.
- Mr. Madrid liked the silo the way it was. Likes the new cap; did not like the "Star Trek" element from before. Likes the traditional look, and thinks the galvanized finish would be appropriate.
- Doesn't like the banding straps; thinks it detracts from the historical, solid message of the silo.
- Thinks the modulation of the color is fantastic. Likes the top windows and appreciates how some of the cornice elements were dropped down.
- Thinks the project is coming together, and everything looks good.

Mr. Cope:

- Thinks it's an excellent package, especially at this time of the development. It's easy to read and very informative.
- Wondered why the applicant didn't mention anything on page 25, the landscaping portion of the project.
- Mr. Cope really likes what's being proposed there, and likes the way it handles water on top of a garage. Thinks it's handsome. Would add, in the next iteration, elements that would encourage people to hang out. Thinks the overlook there is nifty, and people will be there. People should be encouraged to do so.
- Concerned about parking numbers. The parking requirement is being met by "winking," and saying four of the spaces are being used for two different things. 188 have been put in, but 192 are required. Applicant thought he was meeting all the requirements. Applicant mentions there is some surface parking used around the building. Guest parking is being shared with retail, which allows for that overlap.
- Mr. Cope is concerned about the tandem spaces. He assumes they're for the two-bedroom units. There are 28 tandem spaces and 28 two-bedroom units, so that makes sense.
- Thinks it's brave of the client, and appreciates the retail along the right of way. One hopes that's an active pedestrian street at some point, but that would be a ways off in the future. Mr. Cope says that future of pedestrian traffic could be sooner than 20 years, and the retail spaces should be successful. The applicant says he's worked on a project involving BNSF for the last ten years, and mentions that agency doesn't move quickly.
- Mr. Cope has a question about a note that says "lighting fixtures" on page 8. The applicant responds those are the lights Ms. Promer-Nichols was talking about.
- Would like to see the applicant address some sustainability issues in the future.
- Understands Mr. Madrid's concerns about the straps. The only way a strap could work is if the dimension, detail, and thickness of that strap is very well defined. If not, then it shouldn't be done. Mr. Cope says it could stand alone and have a lot of strength. He's siding with Mr. Madrid in that, if the applicant can't reconcile that detail, and if it doesn't add to the project, it could be scrapped. Mr. Cope says there's a round column under it, and would like to see an articulation of a cap or

something to show that it's holding up the silo, even though it isn't. Switching the column to something other than round would look unusual.

- Likes the galvanized elements.
- Mr. Lee points out the applicant is working with modulation and city requirements.
- Mr. Cope is asking if the project is in a historic district. Says the overlay is hurting the project, but doesn't want the applicant to re-design the building. Says the overlay is a good example of something that in 5-10 years will have deprived the city from a variety and an interest that is wanted downtown. Unsure where this message goes, but has concerns the Board won't be happy with this project in the future.
- Applicant points out there are modulation requirements in the zoning code that restrict the project.
- Mr. Cope says there's a similarity and sameness to these projects that will not be as rich and varied for the city when it's all said and done, and that's a shame.
- Applicant points out this project was approved by the board in 2001, then the current architects took over starting from that design.
- Applicant says he took the Cleveland project through the design review process five or six years ago, and did not get that project all the way through. That was a decision the developer made. That project came to the current architects in a similar way to the Center Pointe project came, with a definite look of bay and recess as well as windows and cornices.
- Applicant respects the idea of adaptive re-use, but is always torn by trying to create a look and yet trying to make something a little more interesting, dynamic, and contemporary.
- Mr. Cope says he likes the project, and thinks it will be fine. Really likes the depot a lot. Just has a concern about not doing the right thing with this project overlay, and wants that message to go to somebody.
- Supports the project.

Ms. Velastegui:

- Not there yet in supporting the project. Sees different styles of contemporary vs. historical, but does not believe there's a believable blend between those styles in the project yet.
- Likes the size of the historical elements; thinks they are strong elements that the applicant is not considering.
- That element is not being considered, because the applicant is not taking the round shape to the ground with the silo.
- The proportion and shape of the silo does not go with the rest of the building. Thinks the size should be the main driver of the project.
- Thinks a better consideration of the historical photos would make the difference.
- Concerned about the buildings looking too alike. Thinks there's a great opportunity to make a difference with the rest of the buildings the Board is approving. Is not convinced yet the applicant has found the right solution.
- Says the columns in the corner are totally strange to the project's concept. The struts, in proportion, look like rubber bands. Says that element is too weak. Either make a strong statement or take those elements out.
- Applicant has trouble bringing the silo down to the ground because it would be over the property line.
- In Elevation "A," Ms. Velastegui is concerned about the applicant talking about symmetry regarding the colors, but on the other hand using asymmetry regarding the color shapes. Those two elements are elevated on columns. Either you like symmetry or don't; make a decision. Would like the applicant to decide if the project is historical or not, or a good blend of styles.
- Likes the yard with the framed element; it's modern and she loves it. But it has nothing to do with the rest of the style of the building. Is not seeing the styles through the windows, either.
- Thinks the colors are great, but wants the project put together in a better way. Says the applicant has a great base to work with, but there are different languages speaking from the project at the same time.
- Likes the fenestration in the last level, and says it is a good ending for the building. But the cap is not yet there. Likes the changing rhythm of the windows, but feels still that the proportion of the two columns in the corner is too weak. Applicant could divide the load in the structural walls on the sides in order to have the column, and then suspend that shape. It might sound crazy, but it would avoid the weakness of the project, as she sees it now.

- Would like to see the structural load divided into the walls such that the silo could be flying above the door. Would be better than the current set-up. Wants to mesh with the historical pictures.
- Doesn't like the columns on the other side of the project either. They speak a different language on the project.
- Applicant asks if the element would be stronger if the columns were not there. Ms. Velastegui agrees, because the applicant wants to draw attention to that area, but not to that column. It would not be attractive for an access area. Applicant says raising the silo up, as suggested, would be difficult to do without a column.
- The area in question is an overhanging down, so it can't be brought down in the design, according to the applicant. It would be a violation of the site distance triangle.
- Ms. Velastegui says the historical elements need to be stronger, and says people won't see them in the current design. Says the project could make a beautiful statement.
- Wants to try to make a difference with her work on the Board. Projects look the same all over Seattle, for example, and she wants a good project with the gorgeous proportions of the silos.
- Says the silo is too narrow to the concept of the silo, and comes across as weak. Doesn't even look like a silo now.
- Applicant asks if he took the left-hand corner, and put it more in line with the rectilinear silo forms found in the old historical pictures. Asks if a rounder silo is what Ms. Velastegui is looking for.
- Ms. Velastegui would like to see something that makes a statement, and makes the project more truthful. The project should be a statement of how people live, and what is likable to the city.
- Doesn't want to see the same kind of buildings everywhere.
- It's a great base, and the colors are great. The whole concept, though, is not there yet.
- Says the project feels inconsistent and confusing, perhaps because the architect is picking up on old designs that were already approved.
- Says the magic and soul of the building is missing. Likes the symmetry on one side of the project, but does not see that symmetry throughout.
- Believes there may be a solution in the historical photos. Wants to see more of the silo. Doesn't want the applicant to take her comments personally.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Agrees with Mr. Cope's comment that there's something in the city code that's prohibiting people from taking a risk and doing something.
- The building in Fremont with the "stuff" on it has the same language as this. But it takes a little more risk to get to that point.
- They're all nice buildings, but they're all looking the same. Redmond will become the five over one capital.
- Doesn't like the front door underneath. One has to walk around a column to get to it. Asks if there could be an expression of the door and retail wall where the door is that would go in and express the column.
- Another idea would be to take the footprint of the silo and bring it to the ground, having special paving on the ground that would almost serve as a shadow of the silo. If it can't be physically grounded, there should be another option.
- Applicant asks if the corner was not rectilinear, but rounded, that might be an idea. Ms. Velastegui agrees.
- Ms. Promer-Nichols agrees with Ms. Velastegui about her concerns over the frame in the back.
- Silos were connected by tubing in the past, so that might be an idea for this project.
- Would like the applicant to take a look at the connection between the little depot building and the sidewalk, especially on the west side. Right now all the sidewalks from the little depot building go into the parking lot, and then you have to go across the parking lot to get to the larger building.
- Realizes the buildings are different entities, but the west elevation should have a mid-block connection that the applicant should explore.
- Applicant says if the sidewalk could be extended across the front of the parking stalls, that might be an answer.
- Ms. Promer-Nichols says eventually, there should be connections going across and along the BNSF property line. Right now, the little depot building feels isolated, and it needs to be pulled together.
- Applicant asks about building materials.

- Ms. Velastegui says the idea of using galvanized material is consistent with the silo. The Board is in general agreement on the galvanized material. The applicant asks if it should be smooth or textured. The applicant is considering smooth, sheet galvanized metal, the same material probably used on the silos themselves.
- Ms. Promer-Nichols says a lot of silos do have the corrugated look to them. Says the devil is in the detailing, and if it's not done well, it will look like a riveted-together homemade spaceship.
- Mr. Fischer says a bit of texture might add to it, but fitting that in with the windows will be a bit of a challenge.
- Applicant asks if face fasteners should be used, and the Board is in general agreement on that issue.
- Mr. Madrid brings up that the project needs another pre-application meeting.
- Applicant would like information about the column, and if it should be removed. Understands what Ms. Velastegui was saying about taking it out, but says it would be too tough. Mr. Cope and Ms. Promer-Nichols don't mind the column. The ways to get away with not bringing it to the ground would include the ideas of changing some of the pavement.
- The applicant asks if another corner should use the galvanized material. Mr. Cope suggests the corrugated material there, but leaves it to the applicant.
- Applicant asks what issues need to be re-capped, and generates this list with the help of the board and staff:
 - (1) Details of the silo need to be worked out to determine how the silo meets the ground, or at least how the storefronts on the corner interact with the form of the silo.
 - (2) There are concerns about pedestrian linkage between the depot building to Gilman.
 - (3) The straps on the silo are a concern, but that should be included in the overall silo plan.
 - (4) The idea of activating the courtyard with more invitations to the pedestrians should be considered.
 - (5) The frame in the back of the project needs another look. The concept is fine, but the materials and the expression need to be determined. It's not a historic part of the project, but it's a part that has merit. The Board likes the idea, but doesn't think it works. It could be a trellis, or metal clad columns to speak to the silo motif. Applicant says brick columns might be a possibility too, to tie in with other brick elements in the project. Perhaps there could be a metal frame on top of brick and a heavy cap. A galvanized frame could be included, with a trellis. The grading on the garage looks good.
 - (6) The deck railings may need changing. The Board says if the applicant makes some changes there, they won't get in "historic trouble." Something needs to be introduced to bring in a sense of whimsy, and this might be a good place to do that. The silo will distinguish the building, and other elements could conform to the historic overlay, and the railings wouldn't necessarily have to. The railings weren't in the historic buildings, so it's a chance for fun in the project.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. COPE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:06 PM. MS. VELASTEGUI HAD LEFT THE MEETING PREVIOUSLY. MOTION CARRIED (3-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY